

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of the following remarks.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-6, 8-25, and 31-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reed et al. (US Pub. 2005/0154785; hereinafter “Reed”) in view of Lior (US Pub. 2003/0220925; hereinafter “Lior”) in further view of Casati et al. (US Pub. 2005/0080661; hereinafter “Casati”) in further view of Halim et al. (US Pub. 2004/0111504; hereinafter “Halim”) in further view of Karakashian et al. (US Pub. 2007/0150546; hereinafter “Karakashian”).

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with these rejections, to expedite issuance of a patent from the present applications, Applicants have amended independent Claims 6 and 22. Claim 4 has been amended to be rewritten in independent form. In addition, Claim 37 has been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully submit that the main difference between the present application and the references cited in the pending office action is that while the prior references may be able to classify network traffic associated with individual web service applications, this application is able to classify network traffic associated with *individual operations within* each web service application or network traffic associated with *individual bindings supported* by each web service application (see also, paragraph 27 of the present specification). Consequently the network traffic classification performed by this application is *more granular* than that performed by the prior references.

The classification of network traffic associated with an operation of a web service application was originally recited in Claim 3, which depends on Claim 2, which depends on Claim 20, which in turn depends on Claim 6. Thus, Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations originally recited in Claims 20, 2, 3 (accordingly, Claims 20, 2, 3 have been cancelled). Similarly, Claim 22 has been amended to include the limitations originally recited in 23 and 24 (accordingly, Claims 23 and 24 are cancelled). In addition, Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form, which is directed to the case of classifying network traffic associated with

*individual bindings* supported by a web service application.

More specifically, Claim 6 now recites, among others, defining a first traffic class corresponding to the web service; defining at least *a second traffic class corresponding to an operation of the web service*; and associating at least the second traffic class as a child traffic class of the first traffic class in a hierarchical traffic classification scheme. Claim 22 now recites, among others, process the interface definition document to identify at least a first traffic class corresponding to the selected web service and *at least a second traffic class corresponding to the operation of the selected web service*. Claim 4 now recites, among others, defining a first traffic class corresponding to the web service; defining at least a *second traffic class corresponding to a binding supported by the web service*; and associating at least the second traffic class as a child traffic class of the first traffic class in a hierarchical traffic classification scheme.

The outstanding office action rejects the original and now cancelled Claim 3, alleging that the limitation of “the operation of a web service application” is disclosed in FIG. 4 of Reed. However, based on the description of this figure (see Reed, paragraphs 100-102), FIG. 4 shows how a local service is exposed as a web service. There’s nothing in this figure or its description relating to the classification of network traffic associated with *individual operations of a web service application*. Therefore, by amending claims 6 and 22 to include the “operation” limitation, they are patentable over the references cited in the pending office action. The same reason applies to amended Claim 4.

For above reasons, independent Claims 4, 6, and 22 are patentably distinct from the 5 references. In addition, the currently pending dependent are patentably distinct from the 5 references for at least the same reasons as explained above with respect to Claims 6 and 22.

11 of 11

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all currently pending claims are presently in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application, the Examiner may call Bernadette Lee, Attorney for Applicants, at 650-739-7506.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) of \$810.00 and a two-month extension of time fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(1) of \$130.00 and charge any additional fees and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Bernadette Lee  
Reg. No. 60,298

Date: February 22, 2010

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number: **05073**